REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Claim Status

Claims 1–3, 5–7, 9, 10, 11, 13–15, 17, 18, 20, and 21 are objected to due to various informalities. Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph as being indefinite. Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 sixth paragraph. Claims 1–3, 7, 9–11, 15, and 17–21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Bahl (U.S. 2004/0266493). Applicant respectfully traverses because the cited art fails to teach or suggest every claim limitation. Claims 5–6 and 13–14 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the objections and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Because the independent claims are allowable as explained below, Applicant opts not to amend the claims into independent form.

Applicant amends claims 1–3, 5–7, 9, 10, 11, 13–15, 17, 18, 20, and 21 to overcome the informalities. Applicant amends claims 17 and 21 to overcome the § 112 rejections. Claims 1–3, 5–7, 9–11, 13–15, and 17–21 remain pending.

Objections to Claims 1–3, 5–7, 9, 10, 11, 13–15, 17, 18, 20, and 21

Claims 1–3, 5–7, 9, 10, 11, 13–15, 17, 18, 20, and 21 are objected to due to various informalities. Claims 1–3, 5–7, 9, 10, 11, 13–15, 17, 18, 20, and 21 have been amended to overcome the objections.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph as being indefinite. Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 sixth paragraph. Claims 17 and 21 have been amended to overcome the rejections.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Independent claim 1 recites "a first receiver path for decoding a preamble to a wireless data packet and a second receiver path for decoding a data packet payload." Independent claims 10, 18, and 21 recite similar limitations. The prior art fails to teach or suggest the quoted language. Examiner cites Bahl at ¶¶ 0026–0053 as allegedly teaching the quoted language. However, at ¶ 0053, Bahl teaches "When receiving, the DR Driver receives data packets on one of

its two radios and sends the packets up to the next protocol layer." A DR driver receiving data packets on one of two radios does not teach or suggest a first receiver path for decoding a preamble of the data packet and a second receiver path for decoding the payload of a data packet as required by the claim limitation. Specifically, selecting one of two paths for an entire data packet does not teach or suggest two paths for different portions of the data packet. For at least this reason, independent claims 1, 10, 18, and 21, along with their dependent claims 2–3, 5–7, 9, 11, 13–15, 17, and 19–20 are allowable over Bahl.

Additionally, independent claim 1 recites "[a] wireless receiver ... comprising ... a packet detection logic to identify data packets directed to the wireless receiver." Independent claim 10 recites a similar limitation. Examiner does not cite, and Applicant cannot find where Bahl teaches or suggests the receiver 164, 174 identifies data packets directed toward itself. For at least this additional reason, independent claims 1 and 10, along with their dependent claims 2–3, 5–7, 9, 11, 13–15, and 17, are allowable over Bahl.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicant may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed, or that limitations from the specification can be imported into the claims. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the prior art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in attachments accompanying this document. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this document, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees

required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Texas Instruments Incorporated Deposit Account Number 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,

/Tim D. Chheda/

Tim D. Chheda
Reg. No. 60,752
Attorney for Applicant
Conley Rose, P.C.
P.O. Box 3267
Houston, Texas 77253-3267
Ph: (713) 238-8000